

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are in independent form. Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1, claim 15 depends from claim 14, claim 17 depends from claim 16, claims 19 and 22 depend from claim 18, and claim 21 depends from claim 20. Claims 16, 18, and 20 have been amended, claim 13 was previously cancelled, and claim 22 is new. No new matter has been entered.

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 4 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,245 ("the parent case"). Applicants disagree that claims 16 and 17 are identical to claims 4 and 5 of the parent case. In particular, claims 16 and 17 are believed to be of a different scope since they are not limited to a "stop" and instead refer to a breakaway "member". For this reason, applicants submit that claims 16 and 17 are not of the same scope as claims 4 and 5 of the parent. Applicant has amended claim 16 to replace the word "stop" with the word "member," since the word "stop" was erroneously present.

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,354,953 to Nattel. Claim 18 has been amended to refer to a bracket that is made of a thermoplastic material with the adhering element in the form of an adhesive strip. Nattel teaches a small, thin metal bracket that is welded to the wall of a metal electrical outlet box, not to an adhesive strip that is attached to a plastic bracket. For this reason, Nattel does not anticipate claims 18 and 19. In addition, Nattel does not render claims 18 and 19 obvious, either alone or in combination with other references, because it would not have been obvious to replace the metal weld with an adhesive strip. Moreover, if an adhesive strip were used in place of a weld on Nattel, the bracket portion would be very unstable because Nattel only uses a short wall portion for attaching to the electrical outlet box wall. The present invention uses a greater portion of the side wall, as is also claimed, in order to stabilize the bracket against the wall of the electrical outlet box. For these reasons, the applicants submit that Nattel neither teaches nor suggests the subject matter of the claims.

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Nattel in combination with U.S. Patent No. 4,942,071 to Frye. Frye teaches a multi-layer adhesive strip that is frangible with the application of a normal force. Applicants submit that the combination of Nattel with Frye is unwarranted as an improper application of hindsight. There is no teaching

or suggestion within either Nattel or Frye that the bracket of Nattel could be attached to a side wall of an electrical bracket with anything other than a weld. Moreover, Frye only mentions attaching storage type boxes to walls ,and does not relate in any way to the electrical outlet field. However, even though applicants submit that the combination of Nattel with Frye is improper, applicants have amended the claims to further distinguish from the improper combination. In particular, the bracket of Nattel is attached to the electrical outlet box at the front edge of the box by a thin strip of metal. Since Nattel uses a metal weld to attach the two metal parts, a thin strip of metal is all that is needed in order to secure the bracket to the side wall of the electrical outlet box. If the adhesive strip of Frye were applied to the side wall of the bracket of Nattel, the bracket would likely be very unstable and unusable. In contrast, the presently claimed bracket requires that the adhering element be spaced from the front wall and engage a rear section of the electrical outlet box. This is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Nattel and Frye.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider this application with a view towards allowance. Since this is a continuation application, applicants request that the Examiner telephone the applicants' representative if any issues remain.

No fees are believed to be due with the submission of this Amendment, other than the fee for an additional dependent claim. Should any other fees be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-1432.

Respectfully submitted,



Lorri W. Cooper

Reg. No. 40,038

JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7097

Date: August 30, 2004